

REMARKS

This paper responds to the final Office action dated October 28, 2009, and the advisory action dated February 24, 2010, in which (i) three objections were made to the specification, and (ii) claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The applicants are concurrently filing herewith a request for continued examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.114 with a two-month extension and the requisite fees. The applicants accordingly submit that the finality of the Office action should be withdrawn for entry and consideration of the foregoing amendments.

I. Summary of Amendments

The specification has been amended to remove a sentence regarding moveable flaps from the paragraph starting at page 15, line 2, of the application as filed. The sentence had been added by a previous response, and was the subject of one of the objections to the specification.

No claims have been added or cancelled by the foregoing amendments, leaving claims 1-20 pending and at issue.

Claim 1 has been amended to remove limitations added by the previous response regarding a closed loop of hydrodynamic force and decelerated flow, as well as to specify that each limb has an operational configuration in which inner and outer surfaces thereof are sufficiently continuous to maintain flow over the inner and outer surfaces between forward and rearward ends of the limb without flow through the limb. Claim 6 has been amended to specify that a member includes a flap movably attached to one of the two limbs. No new matter has been added by these amendments, as support can be found, for example, in FIG. 4A and the original claims.

II. Interview Summary

The applicants thank the examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interviews conducted on February 4, 2010, and March 3, 2010, with the undersigned representative. During the first interview, the objections to the specification and the written description rejections were discussed, with no agreement reached. During both interviews, a number of amendments to claim 1 were discussed to overcome the teachings of Peters DE 195 22 035 and Peters WO 95/18036. While no agreement was reached as to the

allowability of the claims, the examiner indicated that claim language regarding the continuous nature of the limbs may successfully distinguish the teachings of the Peters references.

III. Responses to Objections to Specification

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the three objections to the specification are respectfully requested for at least the reasons set forth below. The three objections relate to references to (A) moveable flaps, (B) a closed loop of hydrodynamic force, and (C) decelerated flow relative to a hull. The applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments to the specification and claim 1 render these objections moot.

IV. Responses to Claim Rejections

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, based on the written description requirement for support of the following limitations recited in claim 1: (A) a keel configured to generate a closed loop of hydrodynamic force; and (B) incident flow being decelerated relative to a hull.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections are respectfully requested, insofar as the applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments to claim 1 render these rejections moot.

V. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that all pending claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance, and an indication to that effect is solicited. Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing or any matter of form in an effort to advance this application toward allowance, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number below.

Dated: March 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /G. Christopher Braidwood/
G. Christopher Braidwood, Reg. No. 41,631
LEMPIA BRAIDWOOD LLC
One North LaSalle Street, Suite 3150
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 291-0860
Attorney for Applicant